

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1562. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination, of the Tensas River, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1563. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1564. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Tracy; to the Committee on Claims.

1565. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$5,420,000, and proposed provisions relative to the same appropriation, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

1566. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for his disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1567. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1568. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, amounting to \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and 1943 (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6818. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

House Report No. 1996. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1997. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6917 A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and to the widows, children, and dependents of certain persons, injured while performing duty as firemen on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6918 A bill for the relief of distributors, agents, and dealers of automobiles, motor trucks, and other motor vehicles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6919 A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto new sections authorizing authorized agents of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, or of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, cable, radio or any other similar messages or communications, and the testimony concerning same admissible evidence; requiring telegraph and cable companies to furnish such agencies with copies of communications in their possession or under their possession or under their control upon request; providing punishment for violations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6920 A bill to remove the requirement of a fee for the payment of a money order at an office other than that on which the order is drawn; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6921 A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6922 A bill for the relief of Mrs. August McCall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 6923 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 6924 A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6925 A bill to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfstein, esquire, for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2662. By Mr. HOPE: Petition urging the Federal Government to take action to prevent the giving or dispensing of alcoholic liquors to soldiers or sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2663. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of New York, providing for the enactment of House bill 6806; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2664. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of the local federation No. 92, of Federated Shop Crafts members, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Smith, Boren, and Wickersham bills, and urging retention of labor laws now existing; to the Committee on Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou O Eternal God, who are the Judge and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, we pray that Thou wilt inspire us with a clear vision of Thy holy will and a cheerful obedience to Thy laws.

We humbly confess that again and again we follow the desires of our own hearts, placing our confidence in human ingenuity and material strength apart from Thee. Grant that when Thy judgments are upon the earth the inhabitants thereof may learn righteousness and obedience.

In all the difficult experiences of life may we never give ourselves over to bitter rebellion and sullen resignation, but help us to sing the songs of hope and of high resolve and endeavor, confident that Thou wilt lead us out of darkness into the dawn of a better day.

We pray that the purposes and plans of these Thy servants and all whom Thou hast called to positions of trust and leadership in the life of our Republic may be filled with that wisdom which cometh from above. May the glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, be Thine forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE S. FORRY LAUCKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the death of one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know. Mr. S. Forry Laucks, of York, Pa., an industrial leader of much importance to the Nation, one who was beloved by his employees and who join me today in expressing deep

sorrow at his passing. He was owner of the York Safe & Lock Co., whose business activities covered the entire world and whose product can be found in every part of the civilized world today.

Mr. Laucks was a farsighted gentleman, intensely patriotic, and was the first industrialist in the Nation to obtain an Army contract.

What was a cornfield 9 months ago is now covered with a tremendous ordnance plant making contribution to our national defense of much importance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I voice the sentiment of this legislative body in expressing our sorrow. The fine spirit characteristic of this fine American will mean much to the Nation, and particularly to my section, in the years to come.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record]
S. FORRY LAUCKS

Small enterprises the country over sharing in war production jobbed out to them on subcontracts can thank S. Forry Laucks for the experiment which led to adoption of this national policy.

Laucks, farsighted industrialist, who died last week, had risen to the top the hard way. He started as an office boy for the York Safe & Lock Co. Three years later, when the firm was on the verge of bankruptcy, Laucks became general manager. He not only put it back on its feet but developed it into a world-wide business, equipping principal banks in this and other countries with vaults whose mechanisms were works of outstanding precision.

Pitching into the problems of defense, Laucks was the first industrialist to obtain an Army contract since the last war. He recognized the value of the skill and tools in small independent plants. He worked out the York plan, by which small plants cooperated in handling armament contracts which none of them could have assumed individually.

Today that system has spread defense employment to thousands of men in small mills, machine shops, and two-by-four establishments.

Laucks was the all-too-rare type of liberal industrialist. Pennsylvania will miss his able counsel—in industry, and in politics, in which he was a pioneer New Dealer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a short editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF PIERRE LAVAL AS PREMIER OF FRANCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today a traitor receives his 30 pieces of silver. Pierre Laval has by order of his Nazi master become Premier of the so-called French Government at Vichy. This so-called government does not represent the people of France. It is but an agency of Adolf Hitler.

For nearly 2 years we have hoped that the aged Marshal Petain might be able to salvage some semblance of liberty for the French people. Today all France except such portions of the empire as fight with the United Nations under the leadership of the brave and patriotic General DeGaulle are under the complete control of Germany. And what has this policy of cowardly appeasement secured for the French people? Is their lot any better than that of the heroic Dutch or the brave Norwegians or the indomitable Yugoslavs? At least these people, along with the Greeks, the Czechs, and the Poles, have the respect and admiration of mankind, while the French of Vichy have nothing but the contempt of their conquerors and their friends.

What has French appeasement done to the rest of the world? Vichy France appeased Japan and made possible the Japanese conquest of the Philippines, the Dutch Indies, Singapore, India, and the Far East by turning French Indochina over to the "protective" custody of the Japs. Vichy France appeased Hitler by using American food and oil to supply Rommel's army in North Africa, thereby making necessary continued war in that portion of the world.

Does a Member of this House believe for 1 minute that the arch traitor of modern times will hesitate to turn Madagascar over to the Japs and Dakar to the Germans? Do you wonder why Axis submarines have been able to operate so freely in the Caribbean Sea and off the northeast coast of Brazil? Where do you suppose they are being supplied? If they have not been supplied at Martinique, it is a perfectly safe assumption that with Hitler's stooge in power in Vichy they will be supplied there unless we act now to make it impossible.

The Free French, the real representatives of the French people, are our friends. We should make them our allies. We should aid them in taking possession of these danger points. We should do it today, April 14, 1942. We should repudiate any policy of appeasement. England appeased Hitler and later Mussolini. We appeased Japan. What were the results? Stabs in the back. So it will always be. Thousands of American boys have died in the Philippines because Vichy France was ready even under Marshal Petain to appease Japan. Laval has proved himself to be the enemy of all free people. Let America act today to aid the Free French. Let us have an end to appeasement.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, today we learn that Pierre Laval has become vice premier of Vichy France. Some say this means the delivery of the French Fleet to the Axis. Surely France has not become so depraved. Surely every Frenchman must know that if this fleet is delivered to Hitler, France will never have another fleet regardless of who wins the war.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of M. Laval this minute, I would like to say to him this: Sir, America is going to hold France strictly accountable for all contributions she may make to the aid and comfort of America's enemies, who are also the enemies of France. If the French Fleet is delivered to the Nazis, sir, it will be the complete and inglorious end of the French Nation. The blood of American heroes of yesterday will cry out from the very soil of France itself in protest of such treachery and betrayal. The blood of American heroes now dying for human decency will have its revenge against such French duplicity. Generations of Americans yet unborn will never forget nor forgive such an insult to American faith and honor. Sir, if you want to incur the profound, eternal contempt and hatred of a long, powerful, and honorable friend, if you want to lose the support and incur the enmity for the next 1,000 years of the world's greatest Nation, then, sir, deliver the French Fleet to the Axis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein a statement by the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on the remarkable work that the industries of New Jersey are doing in the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in the Atlantic Legionnaire, entitled "Civil Liberties."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter written to the editor of the New York Times by a distinguished former Member of the House, Hon. William S. Bennet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PHEIFFER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, in my home town of Malone, N. Y., I have a friend who owns and operates his own

drug store. On April 1 he heard of the ruling of the War Production Board and would not sell any tooth paste unless someone turned in an old tube. Many of the people were kind of provoked at him; consequently, they went two doors down the street and stocked up at Woolworth's, where they did not have to turn in any old tubes.

This in itself is a small matter. There are going to be more of these rules put into effect, but I think they should be put into effect in such manner that everyone starts even and not penalize the small business man just because he is patriotic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FLANAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. William Green to me and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE SITUATION OF FRANCE TODAY

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of the two gentlemen from Texas who just preceded me in regard to the situation of France today. I am sure that history will prove that our position with regard to the French and their dealings with the Germans has so far netted us nothing and that if our position in this respect is to be continued it will

result in disaster. Certainly the events of the world in the past few years have proven beyond the possibility of a doubt that no policy of appeasement can be successful, that no policy of appeasement can bring anything but ultimate disaster to the nation which practices it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this Nation should proceed without delay to take possession by force of all French territory which we believe to be necessary to the successful prosecution of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INCREASED PAY FOR SOLDIERS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, scarcely a day passes that several young men, splendid young Americans, do not drop into my office and pay me a personal visit as they come from my district in upstate New York down to the great training camps of the South. In each case it is a great pleasure to witness the patriotism and loyalty they manifest in every statement they make to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House give consideration as early as possible to the bill raising the pay of soldiers from \$21 to \$42. This bill recently passed the Senate and is about to be brought before the House. It is my hope that these sterling young men will be rewarded for their patriotic efforts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] may have an unlimited leave of absence because of a serious illness in his immediate family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about appeasement. I think it is all sound. We have heard a good deal about subversive interests and the necessity of taking them into custody and protecting this country. Nevertheless, you find Harry Bridges running at large. If ever there was a question of appeasement, of mealy-mouthed, weak-sister handling by Government officials, there is a great example. Are they afraid of him? Are they afraid of his power? You are witnessing the effect of his destruction of our merchant marine right now. You cannot rely on him nor his teachings. Nevertheless, Madam Perkins, your Attorney General, and those who are afraid of Harry Bridges are letting him destroy those parts of this Government that would help our defense program. You had better think that over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INCREASED PAY FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I informed the House that Oklahoma was second to Oregon in percentage of voluntary enlistments in the armed forces. Today Oklahoma is first among our 48 States.

I also point with pride to the fact that Oklahoma has received the National Safety Council award, with all the 48 States competing. It has also won for the fifth consecutive time the award from the 14 Southern States in the southern division.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the late Governor E. W. Marland, whom all of you knew, and who formerly served as a Member of the House, is due a great part of this credit, as well as the State senators and representatives in Oklahoma who helped enact the legislation. Also, Walter B. Johnson, the present director of public safety, and our Governor, Leon C. Phillips, and Harold Mueller, president of the State safety commission, and the citizenship as a whole deserves commendation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

IMPORTANCE OF A SOUND TREASURY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, words sometimes are cheap. It requires some intestinal fortitude at a time like this when we talk about appeasement and we are discouraged about things that are happening. Do not stretch out too far; do not go beyond your ability to protect yourself. We should know our own limitations. It is very well to say that the men in the Army should be paid additional money and I quite agree with that, but we should do something back home to stop the radical labor leaders and those who would demand such high and exorbitant wages in industry, both management and labor, and those who wish to have many things that are nonessential for the people of this country at the cost of the overburdened Government Treasury because the country cannot stand the enormous cost. I think that the men in

the armed services ought to receive as much or more than anybody else in this country. They work 24 hours a day and subject themselves to death, but where are you going to get the money? You have got to realize that you cannot fight a war if you do not have a sound Treasury. We cannot fight a war successfully if we cannot finance the Army. We cannot fight a war if we cannot finance the Navy, and we cannot fight a war if we do not finance the Air Service. All these things must be taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

You who would keep on spending and spending so the people back home think you are an angel for giving them something for nothing, beware; you must place additional burdens on them in the form of taxation. Your people will have to pay the bills for your folly of appropriation after appropriation. Be sensible; be sane; be wise. For every dollar expended we should get additional taxes. Ask yourself the question, Where will we get the money? Can the Treasury stand it? Can the country survive if we have a financial break-down?

Can we survive if the President and Congress keep on as they have in the past several years in waste and extravagance? I say there is a wreck ahead if you do not get more wisdom and get it quick.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the Electrical Workers' Journal entitled "Businessman's Attitude," and also I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PAY OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the increase of the soldiers' pay, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that at the time the original conscription bill was introduced, my recollection is that it provided pay for the conscripted boys at the rate of \$5 per month. When the bill came to the House it carried pay at the rate of \$21 a month. When the bill was before this House for final consideration I tried to amend it by providing for a base pay of \$50 per month. I think any Member of Congress or any Member of the Senate of the United States ought to be ashamed of himself if he would ask a man to serve in the United States Army and take the chances on his life for less than \$50 per month. I sincerely hope that when the matter comes before this House for action the House will act unanimously in favor of the raise in the pay of these men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEWSPAPER COLUMNISTS AND THE WAR

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the delicate questions that is now being discussed, and will be discussed very much in the next few months, is how far in this great crisis we are going to allow the newspaper columnists to go in criticism and how far those who talk over the radio are going to be able to criticize and find fault. I have read much discussion of the subject and it is worthy of our careful thought and study. Nowhere have I found it more carefully discussed than in a broadcast of Raymond Gram Swing. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert this broadcast as a part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Little by little the picture begins to piece together of the effort the United States is making in the southwest Pacific. The first American troops to arrive in Australia were on their way to the Philippines, and being too late to be landed there, continued their voyage and reached Australia just before Christmas. These troops left the United States before the outbreak of the war. They were not soldiers comprising a definite unit but were being sent as replacements. Since that time definite units have arrived in Australia in an intermittent stream. Among the first were air units complete with ground forces and planes.

There also are infantry units. The forces already in Australia are great enough for a correspondent to remark that in some Australian cities they outnumber the Australian soldiers to be seen on the streets by as much as 3 to 1.

If a convoy can cross the Pacific to Australia at an average of 10 knots—which is guessing it high—and if the distance from our west coast to Australia is 7,000 miles (one-third the distance around the globe), the actual crossing will take some 29 days. To bring a convoy together, to assemble the forces that are to use it, and to lead them, takes weeks. And it is another guess that at the very least 2 months are needed to transform a decision to send forces to Australia into the actual arrival of the convoy at its Australian destination. Say that a convoy arrived in Australia today, the decision to send it must have been made not later than January 19. The probability is that several convoys have arrived in Australia since that first consignment which had failed to reach the Philippines. And the decision to send them logically must have been made before the middle of January. That brings us back in time to the visit of Prime Minister Churchill, when problems of grand strategy were under consideration. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill conferred and parted, and nothing about grand strategy was revealed—not until troops arrived in Northern Ireland, and then this week when we find Australia already alive with American soldiers and flyers. Then on February 22 the President finally sent the order to General MacArthur to go to Australia to take over the supreme command. The General put off his departure until a few days ago, and whether intentionally or otherwise, he did not put in his appearance until he had a sizable American force as nucleus of his command.

Now I ask you to go back over the weeks preceding Washington's Birthday, with remembrance of what people were saying in this country. It was the time of rising impatience. Some critics needed the President. Many asked what the Navy was doing. The impression could have been made at the time that only the critics knew how to conduct a war and that up at the top there was nothing but inaction. There was, in this time, deep and most human discouragement throughout the

country. The Japanese victories were humiliating, and the inactivity, for so it appeared to be, was increasingly unbearable. Well, there should be a good many red faces in the country today among those who spoke and wrote most ignorantly, and there should be an upsurge of trust among those who, not wishing to weaken morale by public criticism, still were discouraged more than the truth warranted.

This has been lesson No. 1 of America's war on how not to behave in a democracy. It may stimulate more voluntary discipline in the future. For without discipline no war can be won, and the voluntary kind is the only discipline, in the nature of things, that keeps a democracy democratic. Part of this lesson has been that there always are persons ready to exploit public impatience and despair. That is the right of these persons, but it now can be seen that exhortations to patience and confidence would have better fitted the truth. The critics did not further the war effort. They did not speed those troops to Australia by a single hour. They did nothing to hasten General MacArthur's appointment. But they did make a great many people think that their leaders were not doing what precisely they were doing.

Another aspect of the grand strategy that was decided a good while back was sending General Stillwell to Chungking. That was known at the time, but the meaning of it only became clear gradually. First, this American officer became member of the staff of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Today he becomes the commanding officer of two Chinese armies in Burma. He operates under the Generalissimo. So it was decided some while ago that this intertwining of the American with the Chinese interests should be transformed into reality on the field of battle. In other words, the men who are responsible for the grand strategy saw deeply and acted early. How wisely they acted only time will tell. We still know only what we see in Australia and other places. It may be galling not to know just what is being done to meet a certain situation. But this is a war of survival and the war is going to be won only by well-planned action at the front and by unity and work at home. Action at the front, to be effective, has to be prepared in secrecy. Well, today it can be acknowledged that a great deal has been prepared in secrecy, and the trigger jumpers who found fault so immodestly just didn't know what they were talking about. And this is an appropriate moment to expect a rededication to unity. And an ingredient of national unity is trust in leadership until that leadership has demonstrated that it is not leading. Another ingredient is patience. There are others, but it is chiefly these which have been lacking.

WAGES AND HOURS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately from labor leaders about the propaganda to set aside the wage-hour law. Just look at this labor-paid page ad in yesterday's Washington Post, full of untruth. That is a very different propaganda on the side of labor, now taking the aggressive to keep itself above the Government. I have just come back from my district, where I held open forums in all 10 county seats with large attendance everywhere, and I say to my friends the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that the people of northeast Kansas are 95 percent with them in setting aside the wage-hour law in defense for the duration, also the closed shop, and limiting the profits of production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two places.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF SOLDIERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who spoke about the soldiers getting more pay, to the fact that I introduced a bill some time ago which provides that the soldiers in the combat area and the combat service receive the same compensation that the workers at home are receiving in the industrial plants. I hope the gentleman will get back of that bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And I say to the gentleman that I worked for years and years to readjust the compensation of the veterans of the World War, and that now is the time for us to adjust the compensation of these boys while they are living and can use it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suggest the gentleman get back of that bill I introduced. It is a good one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

AIRPLANE ENGINE FACTORY DENIED ST. LOUIS—INSUFFICIENT POWER

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of April there appeared in the press and particularly in the St. Louis press, an article to the effect that the city of St. Louis had been denied an airplane-engine factory, a \$30,000,000 airplane-engine factory, because of the lack of sufficient power. That must have carried with it a note of irony for some of us, in view of the debates held in this House only a few days ago, in which the Bull Shoals and the Table Rock Dams in Arkansas and Missouri were denied by this House, even though the President of the United States, the War Production Board, the War Department, all said they were necessary in view of what the Army had in mind for that area.

The amendment to strike Bull Shoals was offered by the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. COCHRAN].

Los Angeles gets its power from Boulder Dam, 240 miles away. St. Louis is only 215 miles from Table Rock and Bull Shoals. These dams could be built

in 2½ years and would produce 880,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power annually.

Arkansas has been specifically denied one aluminum plant and one synthetic-rubber plant for lack of sufficient power.

I quote from a St. Louis paper:

CITY VIRTUALLY RULED OUT AS PLANT SITE—NOT ENOUGH POWER GUARANTEED FOR ENGINE FACTORY, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD OFFICIAL SAYS

(By Sam O'Neal)

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Edwin M. Martin, chairman of the plant site board of the War Production Board, which passes on all new war production plant locations, said today St. Louis has been virtually eliminated from consideration as the site of a \$30,000,000 airplane engine factory because of inadequate power facilities.

Martin told the Star-Times the past record of labor unions engaged in war production in St. Louis was not the deciding factor.

"The proposed new plant will require a power load of 20,000 to 30,000 kilowatts," Martin said. "The power division of War Production Board and officials of Union Electric Co. of Missouri agree that much power cannot be guaranteed in St. Louis."

"Two other cities have a surplus of power for the project and we must take that into consideration. As matters stand now, St. Louis is about out of the picture."

CLARK ALSO INFORMED

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, who, with his Missouri colleague, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, has been working to obtain the plane engine plant for St. Louis, said he also had been advised today that lack of power had become what appeared to be an insurmountable barrier to St. Louis' prospects of getting the new industry.

The Star-Times disclosed exclusively on January 28 that experts of the Federal Power Commission and the power division of War Production Board, headed by J. A. Krug, were convinced that St. Louis industrial area would be confronted with a serious power shortage before the end of 1942, and had drafted a tentative plan for rationing power there.

Because of the power situation, Martin asserted in an interview with the Star-Times that the plant site board had not given serious consideration to the opposition in military and aviation circles to locating the plant in St. Louis because of the city's past labor record in plants with war contracts.

He said, however, that work stoppages, impeding war production in the St. Louis industrial area prior to the Pearl Harbor attack would have been a formidable barrier if the power situation had not prevailed.

Some other War Production Board officials in conversations with the Star-Times used strong language to describe their attitude toward some labor leaders in St. Louis.

It also was learned that opposition to locating war plants in the St. Louis area still prevails in high military circles and among war industry leaders.

MANAGEMENT DUBIOUS

The Plant Site Board usually gives executives of companies for which new war production factories are being built some voice in selecting sites. It is known the management of the airplane-engine company was dubious about locating in St. Louis because of labor conditions.

Because this unfavorable attitude may make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for St. Louis to get any other war industries, several prominent persons here interested in the city's welfare are going ahead in their efforts to exact pledges from labor leaders that there will be no recurrence of labor troubles which have marred the city's past record.

The St. Louis labor supply, becoming an increasingly important factor in plant locations as the Nation heads into a possible manpower shortage this fall, has not been an issue in the Plant Site Board's consideration of the city for the engine plant, which will employ about 30,000 workers.

PRIORITIES OPENED FIELD

"Six months ago," Martin said, "it looked like there might be a serious shortage of labor in St. Louis. However, priorities have closed so many plants there that it now looks like the labor supply will be ample to meet the needs."

Thus only two obstacles, but both formidable, must be removed before St. Louis can hope to successfully bid for new war industries. They are: (1) Increased power facilities, and (2) improvement in the labor situation.

It was emphasized by Martin and others that allowances have been made, in forecasting a power shortage in St. Louis, for the recent addition of 40,000 kilowatts of capacity by Union Electric and the plan to gain another additional 40,000 kilowatts soon, plus prospects of an additional 80,000 kilowatts under schedule.

UNION ELECTRIC'S POSITION GIVEN

J. Wesley McAfee, president of Union Electric, told the Star-Times today: "If the Government wants to put the engine plant here, we'll deliver the power, but then certain other Government plans for expansion of existing war facilities here will have to be foregone."

"The whole problem is simply a question of what the Government wants to do."

McAfee explained that three men from Union Electric went to Washington 2 weeks ago and discussed all the potentialities of the power situation here. The decision at that time was, he said, that if as-yet-unrevealed plans for the expansion of such plants as the TNT plant at Weldon Spring and the small-arms ammunition plant go through, there will not be power available for the proposed airplane-engine factory.

COMPANY'S POSITION

"I am in a somewhat peculiar position," said McAfee. "If I try to say that we are now delivering all the power we can generate, anyone can check up and find that it isn't true. We are adding 40,000 kilowatts within the next few days. In September we'll add 80,000 more, and at the beginning of next year there will be another 80,000. That means a total of 200,000 more kilowatts, enough to handle easily the 30,000 increase the engine plant would mean."

"But the point is there are certain plans under foot, plans I am not at liberty to reveal, that call for the use of all that power."

"Now, of course, if the Government decides it doesn't want to follow those plans but instead wants to put the new plant here, we can deliver the power. But there will have to be a decision."

POSSIBILITIES OF SAVING

Asked whether reduction in civilian use might give the company enough additional power to fill expansion plans and the engine factory as well, McAfee said a survey had been made and it was determined that strictest restrictions on civilian use would increase the available power for industrial use by only about 1 percent.

Possible curtailment of nonwar industrial effort had also been considered, he stated, but Washington seemed inclined to let priority restrictions cut down such industries rather than close them by edict to gain more power.

"If the Government wants us to cut off those consumers, however," McAfee said, "we're willing to do it. The policy of doing whatever the Government wants is not only the policy we want to follow but the policy we have to follow."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] is here with his Arkansas Valley Authority again.

Now, the gentleman gives us the startling information that due to a shortage of power, the city of St. Louis, of which I have the honor to represent in part, is going to be deprived of a \$30,000,000 defense plant. Now, what are the facts? Mr. Donald Nelson felt that St. Louis would be an excellent place for either a bomber plant or an airplane engine plant. At the outset another official took the position that due to a labor situation in St. Louis the Army Air Corps did not want to go into that city. When it was shown that there was no labor trouble in St. Louis, that all of the labor organizations pledged themselves to cooperate in every manner, shape or form with the Government, then someone raised the question as to whether or not there was sufficient power available in St. Louis for such a plant.

Now, as far as the city of St. Louis is concerned, I can say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I think it will be able to take care of itself. The gentleman from Arkansas, however, makes this statement, not for the purpose of advising the House that St. Louis might lose a national defense plant due to a shortage of power, but he seeks to create the impression that if the Congress authorizes the construction of the power dams at Table Rock on the White River in Missouri and at Bull Shoals in Arkansas, power would be available for a national defense plant in St. Louis.

First of all, let me say that officials who should know what they are talking about say there is not a shortage of power in St. Louis. Assuming that there was a shortage of power in St. Louis, the gentleman from Arkansas knows full well that the power dams at Bull Shoals and Table Rock could not be completed until 1944 or 1945, and then only if turbines were available. Now I am advised that it is no easy matter to get priorities for turbines. If anyone doubts that statement, let him ask the Federal Power Commission. Aside from the turbines, of course, everyone knows that copper is absolutely at a premium. Transmission lines are needed in connection with any power dam.

I do not want to convey the impression that it would be necessary to construct transmission lines all the way from Bull Shoals and Table Rock to St. Louis, but it might be interesting for one to consider the distance between St. Louis and these two projects. Table Rock is just north of the Arkansas boundary line and is approximately 275 miles from St. Louis. To reach Bull Shoals it is necessary to cross into Arkansas and travel 10 miles, if not more. I do not feel that anybody will question the statement that 275 miles is quite a distance.

Any statement such as the gentleman from Arkansas makes relative to a shortage of power in St. Louis is certainly not

going to remove my objections to the construction of the power dams at Table Rock and Bull Shoals. I do not feel that the House of Representatives should authorize an expenditure of \$87,500,000, when everyone in authority admits that with no interruption whatsoever from the standpoint of securing the necessary material, the projects could not be completed until 1944 or 1945.

In northern Arkansas you have one outstanding national defense plant, an aluminum project. The Government is building a \$20,000,000 power project to serve the aluminum plant. This is in itself an example that the Government would not wait for the construction of a hydroelectric plant either at Norfolk, Bull Shoals, or Table Rock for power for a national defense plant that it wants in operation at an early date. If it is feasible for the Government to construct a \$20,000,000 power project for the aluminum plant, would it not be justified in constructing a plant with whatever amount was necessary to operate a bomber or engine plant in St. Louis, provided those in authority felt that was necessary from the standpoint of prosecuting the war? You could construct a power plant on the Mississippi River in St. Louis, generate power from coal, as several private plants are now doing there, and complete it in months, where it would take years to secure power transmitted to St. Louis from the power projects which the gentleman from Arkansas advocates.

I will tell the gentleman from Arkansas now that my answer is "No" insofar as Table Rock and Bull Shoals are concerned. He cannot change my opinion by simply calling attention of the House to the fact that there was a newspaper article that indicated St. Louis might lose a \$30,000,000 plant due to a shortage of power. His project certainly would not help this situation in the least. Therefore, when the War Department civil functions appropriation bill returns to the House, I will continue my opposition to the two projects which he advances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun of April 5, 1942, by Mr. Arnold Sullivan, entitled "Sixth Columnists."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SECREST was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Evening Star on the death of the bandmen on the ill-fated Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, having lately returned from a short visit to my district, as most of the Members have been privileged to do, I feel under the necessity of calling attention to one problem that is very, very acute and that is causing a great deal of uncertainty and unrest at this time. I think it may safely be said that under the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which in effect provides that private property shall not be taken without due process of law and without just compensation, the effect of the order of the Price Administrator freezing stocks of new automobiles and trucks was to seize and confiscate the property of private individuals and corporations without making any provision for compensation for the property in effect seized.

Now, we have recognized the justice of the fifth amendment to the Constitution in law after law down through the years. The most recent debates on the subject were in connection with the war powers bill, where this Congress endeavored to very jealously and zealously protect the rights of private property that might be taken in connection with the war effort and to provide for compensation. It has been recognized in the theory of eminent domain, the right to compensation where property is taken for public use. While the analogy may not be exactly accurate, the effect, insofar as the automobile retail dealers are concerned, is exactly the same.

Let me cite a concrete case of a dealer in my district. When that freezing order went into effect he had some three-hundred-odd new cars in his stock. He occupies not only one garage, but several. He occupies other buildings where these new cars and trucks are stored.

In the normal conduct of his business, that would be a small number of cars for him to dispose of at retail. The freezing order caught him with those cars. It caught many other dealers with new cars on their floors. Many of them are financially able to handle the situation, perhaps, for a short time, but many of the small dealers have those cars financed on floor plans by finance companies. Now they are compelled to sit there and await the opportunity to sell a new car on a certificate issued by the local rationing board. How many cars are being sold under this rationing program? The number is infinitesimal. All rationing boards throughout the country are of the opinion—and I have contacted a number of them—that the program is not working out. If the present program is continued these dealers are all going to be faced with ultimate bankruptcy.

To me it is an unfair proposition to say to a man who is in a legitimate business of selling transportation in the form of new cars, "Your business is going to be closed up. Your property is going to be frozen. You cannot dispose of your stocks except under rationing regulations." The patriotic dealer responded splendidly, but had every reason to expect that the Government would protect him in some reasonable way so that he would

not be forced to lose not only his job and income but also his life's work.

Mr. Speaker, such a situation confronts the dealers of America today, and a good Government must not expect these dealers to accept their fate without a fight.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. BURDICK. Does the Government pretend to make any arrangements by which they will take over this stock, or do they let the dealers simply sit there and take all the loss?

Mr. KEEFE. The situation at the present time is that the Government has done nothing. There are a number of bills pending in this House and in the Senate that propose to give some relief, through the medium of loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other types of relief to those dealers. There is a bill pending which proposes to make some concessions and protection in the matter of leaseholds and rents. It seems to me, however, that when the Government froze that stock of new cars they had in mind some governmental necessity for those cars. By this action the Government just as effectively seized these cars as though it had proceeded in condemnation proceedings. The difference is, however, that the dealer has received no compensation for his property.

In the case of the dealer I have in mind, with the allotment of new cars in the county in which he is operating, he will be years and years before he is able to sell his stock of new cars. Now what is happening? He has to service those cars constantly. He has to keep the batteries charged. He has to see that air is placed in those tires. He has to pay storage charges in buildings to store them. His expense and overhead is eating him up, so that he, like every other garage owner in this country, will face ultimate, complete financial ruin unless some aid is extended by this Government.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HARNES. I presume the gentleman has in mind also the fact that these new cars have started to deteriorate, that parts are rusting because it is impossible for them to be moved?

Mr. KEEFE. I was told when I was home that there are hundreds of cars exposed to the weather that are lying on the docks, that have been transported across the Great Lakes from Detroit, that are absolutely deteriorating out in the fields where the tires are down in the mud; and these people cannot move these cars. To me it is a complete economic loss. Under the present rationing proposition, yes, a defense worker can go to a rationing board and perhaps if he can show qualifications he can get a certificate for a new car. The number of certificates that have been issued in my county is perfectly absurd; they would not keep one garage operating. What is the result? A man goes to a rationing board, gets a certificate to buy a car if he is eligible. He is a marked man; every dealer in the county follows that man around because he has it in his power to purchase a new car. And what is the result? Dealers are so anxious to dis-

pose of their frozen stocks that they will make deals with holders of certificates so that there is absolutely no profit in the deal and perhaps an ultimate loss to the dealer when he makes the deal, because he figures his loss will not be as great under those circumstances as it would be if he were compelled to sit there and hold that car.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps the most practical solution to this would be for Congress to authorize the R. F. C. to take over all this stock of cars that is held by dealers, or to have some other governmental agency take possession and ownership of these stocks?

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that if there be any justification for the rationing order at all, the justification lies in the fact that the Government is attempting by this rationing procedure to protect and conserve absolutely needed transportation facilities, and to eliminate these cars being placed in the category of purely pleasure vehicles, and in the hands of purely pleasure drivers on the highways. If this be true, and if it be necessary for the preservation of the war effort, then it seems to me it is only fair to these garage dealers that the Government step in and take these cars off the hands of these people who have them on their floors and cannot do anything with them. A mere loan, in my opinion, will not be sufficient, because the servicing of that loan will put the dealer in a position where he cannot meet his obligation due to his continued expense of overhead and depreciation that is taking place.

Let me call your attention to the fact that finance companies throughout the country are stepping in and taking cars that have been financed on the floor plan, taking them into their possession. I do not know whether they are able to sell; I understand they are not; they have to still store them. The whole thing is in a state of chaos. Take the case, for example, of a salesman working for a garage who bought a 1942 demonstrator late last year. He cannot sell that car without a certificate from the rationing board. Most of such salesmen bought their demonstrators on a monthly payment plan through a financing company; most of them have an equity in their cars. They should be allowed to sell their cars and get their equity out, for their jobs and their chance to make a livelihood are gone. The freezing provisions prohibit these salesmen from getting their equity out of their cars when they are out of employment and permits the finance company to come in and take those cars away from the salesmen.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The clothing by Congress of the R. F. C. with additional powers to make loans in the critical situation to which the gentleman directs our attention today would only partially solve a very acute problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Office of Price Administration, taking the responsibility for the freezing of this stock of the automobile dealers of America, has also the added responsibility of seeing that these men are not faced with financial ruin through an edict of the Government of the United States.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from West Virginia has said; I agree also with the previous expressions made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for Congress to take some action at this time in order to authorize the Government purchase of these stocks of the dealers. As a consequence some action must be taken before the O. P. A. has the authority to take over these stocks and pay for them. I do not know whether the R. F. C. is permitted at the present time through the Defense Plant Corporation or some other agency to take over the ownership of these cars or not, but certainly legislation must be provided so that some governmental agency will be able to relieve these dealers of these stocks.

Mr. KEEFE. Everybody knows something about business; he knows what overhead will do, continuing overhead applied to just a few occasional sales as in the case of the dealer I am talking about, the man who used to sell a couple of thousand cars a year. His overhead must be spread now over the possible sale of perhaps 50 cars. What is it going to do to him? It is bound to put him out of business; and Congress must act in this matter and do it at once. We cannot delay this matter; it will be too late.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to congratulate the gentleman for calling the attention of the House and the Congress to this critical situation. The conditions the gentleman has described as existing in his State are typical of the conditions existing in my own State. The Government of the United States owes the duty to these people whose cars are frozen to compensate those people just as much as if the Government went out and condemned my property. In the latter instance I would be entitled to just compensation. Those people are entitled to just compensation if their cars are taken in that manner.

Mr. KEEFE. May I call attention to another situation. Here is a dealer I talked with. They are simply frantic, their life work is involved in the operation of this business, they do not know what they are going to do. Here is a man with 23 new cars on the floor. He is in a rented garage. He has his equipment there, he has his repair business there, his books are there; he has been conducting business there for years. Now, that man simply cannot move out. He has no place to take those cars. He wants to quit business, he wants to stop, he wants to get into something else and

find a job. But he is saddled with those cars around his neck and he does not know what to do with them.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Some few weeks ago or perhaps a month ago, this House appointed a special committee to investigate the small businessmen's affairs. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman of that committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand so.

Mr. MAY. I took before that committee a Mr. H. H. Loring, of Norfolk, Va., who had some \$600,000 of an investment in automobiles and in automobile equipment. He made a clean-cut statement of the situation as it applies to some 40,000 dealers in this country. It looks as if we ought to get some legislation through.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that we talk, talk, and talk, and we have committees that investigate, investigate, and investigate; but we are not going to win this war with talk, either on the floor of this House or at any other place, and we are not going to solve this problem with talk. I know I am talking now, but I am trying in the only effective way that I know how to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress so that something may be done.

This Government must do something to solve the situation because it is unfair to take the stocks of these people, freeze them and put the dealers out of business. Let me give you an illustration as to how this fear has crept into other business.

Out in my district there are a number of great grocery chains that have unlimited stocks of sugar in their warehouses and in their stores. When the idea of sugar rationing came out, in a patriotic gesture they started to ration sugar in 2-pound sacks. That is all they would sell to a customer. Now, when they see what has happened to the automobile dealer, they are not going to continue to take a chance of having their investment in that sugar frozen, and I know of my own knowledge that certain of them have been delivering sugar in 100-pound sacks to anybody who wants to come and get it. The explanation is, "We are not going to sit here and hold this sugar and be subjected to a rationing program that will not permit us to get rid of it for perhaps the next 10 years by selling it in 2-pound packages."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is performing a great service by emphasizing this situation, which I think is critical and inexcusable. We are by Government edict confiscating the business of the automobile and tire people. Let me direct the gentleman's attention to this fact, and the gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee: Reference has been made to the Government taking over these cars. We have appropriated, or when the bill now pending in the Senate passes we will have appropriated, so far as we know, everything that the Army, the Navy, and the

Government needs presently for transportation. I would hate to see the Government get control of all these cars with the temptation that there would be to send them out to departments where they are not needed. What should be done, and it ought to be done immediately and it could be done, is for the Government to take the cars that the Government needs, and they know now what they need, out of these frozen stocks and immediately release the rest of them. That would solve the problem. It could be done in 30 days, and it ought to be done.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the proposition. The Government should take out of these frozen stocks of cars and trucks all of the things that they need for governmental activities and the balance of these cars, so far as this rationing business is concerned, should be immediately released so that these dealers can get their investment out, and so that this transportation will be in the hands of the people. That is all there is to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an article I wrote for the South Dakota Republican Herald on the progress of the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years now the House of Representatives has been endeavoring to amend the National Labor Relations Act and bring some order out of the chaos in labor relations. We have been unsuccessful in doing so. For the last several months the Congress has been trying to work out and adopt some formula to do away with the racket of requiring American citizens to pay tribute to labor unions for the privilege of working for their country. Up to this time we have been unsuccessful.

I think the Congress ought to know that we have what appears to be another legislative body in competition with us here in Washington. I refer to the War Labor Board set-up by the President, which has no authority from the Congress. It is set up by Executive order. The purpose behind the War Labor Board is all right and I approve of it and am for it, because we ought to get these disputes settled, but when the War Labor Board undertakes to amend the National Labor Relations Act and when the War Labor Board undertakes to impose upon American workmen the condition that they cannot work without paying tribute to the labor unions, it is going further than this Congress has ever been willing to go.

The particular instance to which I wish to call the attention of the House is a decision rendered by the War Labor

Board a couple of days ago in the case of the Walker Turner Co. against the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America. The facts of that case are that that company has declined to give the union a closed shop and has declined to give it a union shop. The matter went to the War Labor Board and was there considered. Only day before yesterday that Board handed down a decision in which they ordered, ordered by compulsion, that every man who is a member of that union must remain as a member of that union as a condition of his employment. That is in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act, section 8.

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization.

It is obvious that to require an employee, as a condition of employment, to remain a member of a particular union whether he wants to or not is doing the very thing the law says cannot be done; namely, encouraging membership in a labor organization.

There is one exception, and only one exception, to that rule laid down in section 8, and that is that it does not preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization to require as a condition of employment membership therein, and so forth, but that is predicated upon an agreement; in other words, the law states that if the union and the company agree voluntarily, of their own volition, to a closed shop the law authorizes that, but there is no law anywhere on earth that authorizes any court, or anybody, set up by any Executive order, to require that a man shall either be or remain a member of a labor union, and any court or any board that at this time imposes upon any employee the obligation as a condition of employment that he must belong to a labor union is acting in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act, which Congress enacted and which Congress up to now has never been able to amend.

It is a queer thing that Congress, which, under the Constitution, is supposed to be the legislative arm of the Government, has been trying to correct these evils. The House has passed legislation amending the National Labor Relations Act, and we are right now in the midst of a very heated discussion in an attempt to enact law that will insure to American workmen that they can work for their country without paying tribute to anybody.

The sentiment of this Nation is overwhelmingly for that principle of the right to work without paying tribute. The sentiment of this Congress is overwhelmingly for the proposition that free American citizens must be permitted to work without paying tribute to anybody. Yet we find in the face of that sentiment and in the face of the fact that Congress is at this moment considering the remedy for that evil, that a board set up with no

legislative authority, by Executive order, presumes to so amend the National Labor Relations Act as to require American citizens to pay tribute for the privilege of working.

It is a coincidence, but it so happened that just last week the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision on that question in the case of National Labor Relations Board against the Electric Vacuum Cleaner Corporation. The situation there was this: The company had an agreement with certain affiliates of the American Federation of Labor. They had what was known as a union-shop agreement, that everybody had to belong to the union in order to work. That was a written contract. It had been lived up to. But along came the C. I. O. and decided that there is some good gravy in that corporation and that it would like to have that membership, and it decided to try to organize it.

Apparently, from the facts stated in that case, the company did not want the C. I. O. to organize, it having already made an agreement with this American Federation of Labor union. The company proceeded to give the American Federation of Labor a closed-shop contract.

The Supreme Court in that case holds that that company violated the National Labor Relations Act just as the War Labor Board yesterday violated the National Labor Relations Act. They violated it because they had given to this union a union shop and followed it by a closed-shop agreement, and the Court held that giving them this union shop was a discrimination because a man belonged or did not belong to a labor union and therefore set the whole thing aside.

Now if these rival legislative bodies we have around Washington here are going to continue to operate, I want to express the hope that they will at least read the laws that they are supposed to act upon; and if they do not know anything about them themselves, that they will employ competent counsel who will know and can advise them as to the law. I express the further hope that they will put themselves in line with the decisions of the Supreme Court, if they are going to usurp the powers of Congress and are not going to wait until we can enact a law that says that American citizens shall not be compelled to pay tribute in order to work for their company. If they say Congress shall not do that and that they are going to fix up this closed-shop matter before we get around to it, I hope at least they will conform to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

You know there are supposed to be three branches of government. We are supposed to be the legislative branch; we are supposed to make the laws; and the Supreme Court is supposed to be the judicial branch, and they are supposed to construe the laws; and the executive branch is supposed to execute the laws. Now, if these executive agencies are going to make the laws and then construe the laws, I hope that they will at least pay some attention to the sentiment of this Nation, which is that no man ought

to be required to pay tribute to anybody for the privilege of working, and I hope they will pay some attention to this particular case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States last week.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is known as a good lawyer, has had judicial experience, and I would just like to have the benefit of his observation on this question. Since the Congress, as the legislative branch of the Government, has enacted legislation to set up a Labor Relations Board and invested that Board with the right to make determinations and issue orders, is it within the province of the executive branch of the Government to order something in conflict with what the legislative branch of the Government has already done?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I believe I shall answer the gentleman in this way. I do not want to be critical of the theory of the War Labor Board. I think we have to do a lot of things during this war in a little different way from what we would do them in normal times, and I approve of the idea of having any kind of board and every kind of board that will try to straighten these things out, as long as they live within the law. The complaint I am making this morning is that only Congress ought to be able to amend the National Labor Relations Act and not the War Labor Board.

Mr. MAY. That is the very question I asked the gentleman, whether or not it is within the power of the executive branch to make a ruling in conflict with that act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course not.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is correct in saying that the War Labor Board is not a creature of Congress. Where do they get the funds to operate in that case?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The truth is we have written a lot of blank checks around here in the days gone by.

Mr. KEAN. Then the money comes from one of these blank-check funds and is probably passed on by the President.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no information about that and I would rather not answer that question.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping yesterday that some Member who had been in the House many more years than I would give us a eulogy on the man whose democratic principles we are trying to preserve today—Thomas Jefferson, whose birthday we celebrated yesterday.

I happen to be occupying room 1013 in the new House Office Building, and right opposite the room on the concrete railing along there is a bronze tablet, and on that bronze tablet is inscribed the following:

Site of hotel of Conrad and McMunn, where boarded Thomas Jefferson, and from where he went to be inaugurated President of the United States March 4, 1801.

In other words, the room I occupy in the new House Office Building is exactly on the site where Thomas Jefferson had his room when he went to be inaugurated President of the United States, and I think it quite an honor to occupy that room, and I also think it quite an honor to get up here today and say that one of these days all of us will have an opportunity to go down here where we took up some old Korean cherry trees and dedicate a memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

For many years resolutions came before Congress to build a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. It was our late beloved colleague, Hon. John J. Boylan, of New York, a member of our Appropriations Committee, who was the sparkplug back of the move to build this memorial. The Deficiency Appropriations Committee in October 1938 included the money to start building this memorial, and the following year gave the additional amount necessary for its completion. Those on the Deficiency Appropriations Committee at the time were: Hon. Edward T. Taylor, chairman; Hon. Clarence Cannon; Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum; Hon. John J. Boylan; Hon. Louis Ludlow; Hon. Thomas McMillan; Hon. J. Buell Snyder; Hon. John Taber; Hon. Robert L. Bacon; and Hon. Richard B. Wigglesworth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a statement entitled "Bituminous Coal Is the Critical Material."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL SHORT AND ADMIRAL KIMMEL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 last, Army Day, I delivered an address at Pikesville, Ky., portions of which have been quoted in the press and widely circulated, and in many respects misinterpreted. So far as I was quoted in the press and so far as I have read those quotations, I think they were substantially correct, but the misrepresentation and the misinterpretation by a few people, from whom I received some three or four letters, is due to the fact that all I said on the particular subject relating to General Short and Admiral Kimmel was not reported in the newspapers. I was quoted in the press at large as having favored the shooting of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, and this was done without

any mention whatever of a prefatory statement which I used before making that remark. I said in substance that if, after a full, fair, and complete court-martial hearing, it was found that General Short and Admiral Kimmel were guilty of criminal negligence, resulting in the death of some 3,400 of our young men, I believed I would favor a shooting match. For that statement I have no apology to make.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. In just a moment. Having had considerable experience in the practice of the law before I came to Congress, and having spent several months on the bench, I am not in the habit of wanting to execute men without a trial. As a matter of fact, over a period of over 35 years of actual law practice—and by the way, I was admitted 42 years ago—I prosecuted a great many men for crimes involving their lives and liberty. I defended a great many more than I prosecuted. I would never condemn any man, and in fact I would not even condemn a sheep-killing dog, without a fair trial. I now yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, knowing the gentleman from Kentucky as I do, I know that he is an A No. 1 lawyer, and that usually he is the defender of anybody in trouble. I just could not imagine the gentleman wanting anybody to engage in a shooting match, or wanting them to be shot without having first a fair trial, and I really felt that the press had misquoted the gentleman when I read that, knowing him as I do. I see now that my idea about the gentleman was justified, when he says he would not shoot even a sheep-killing dog without giving it a fair trial.

Mr. MAY. I believe in equal and exact justice to all men, with special privileges to none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND SHOPS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PACE). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most constructive speeches that has been made in Congress in a long time was delivered this afternoon by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in connection with the freezing order which froze all automobiles as of January 1, and in connection therewith, the other freezing and rationing orders of the Office of Price Administration, in connection with automobiles, rubber tires, and so forth.

I think the contributions made in the course of that discussion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and by others, were very constructive and very helpful. I want to say to the Members of this House that the American public ought to know that it was an agency of the executive branch of the Government which issued those orders. Four hundred and thirty-five Members of

Congress cannot handle details of war agencies in connection with war problems. The Congress has the job of passing legislation that will enable the Commander in Chief, through his deputies, and agencies to do the job.

In my opinion, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], demonstrated clearly, fairly, and squarely the inefficiency, and total lack of appreciation on the part of someone in the Office of Price Administration of the problems of the American people and of the steps that ought to be taken to win the war. The best way to lose this war is to retain inefficient, short-sighted men in responsible executive positions where they can punish small American businessmen, and the automobile dealer, and others where the average American citizen is going to be ruined. Those things related by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] ought not take place. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a great contribution in pointing out this inefficiency. It is now up to the executive department of the Government to do some housecleaning.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been very much interested in what the gentleman has said and what those who preceded him have said. I am inclined to agree with a great deal of it. For instance, the automobile dealers have been severely punished—

Mr. PITTENGER. They have been ruined—not punished, but ruined.

Mr. BROOKS. They are being forced out of business, but would the gentleman go a step further? For instance, I saw in the papers about 10 days ago that six oil refineries in the Houston area of Texas were being closed down by order of the War Production Board for a similar reason. Would the gentleman go a step further and take care of them also?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. You would take care of all of them?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes. I would say we do not want inexperienced men in Government positions issuing orders that will put small businessmen out of business, the way it is being done, unless there is absolute necessity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes, following any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by inserting therein a copy of an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, at Boston, March 17, at the two hundred and fifth annual dinner of the Charitable Irish Society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXATION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of discussion throughout the country as to the merits and demerits of a general sales tax. The impact of this discussion naturally reacts on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, which is holding sessions to study every possible avenue through which the Government can reap tax revenues.

If the war and the spending continue, as they bid fair to do, a general sales tax, unwelcome as it is, may have to be considered. In the meantime there is a form of vicious, uncontrolled, hidden sales tax which is being permitted to go on day after day. That is inflation of prices.

There are two ways of taxing the consumer. One is by direct taxation, which is painful. The other is by indirect taxation, which is less painful, but just as burdensome. Hidden taxes have always been one of the forms of taxation. It is, of course, elementary with economists that price at the point of consumption is entirely costs plus all profits. Hidden taxes are taxes passed on from hand to hand in the form of the price of the product or service, and paid by the consumer without his realizing what percentage of the price of the things he buys is actually cost of production plus profits, and what percentage is taxation.

In direct taxation the Government collects the tax. In indirect taxation, as in inflationary prices, the Government lets the businessman collect the tax and then the Government can recover from the businessman, the latter acting as a collection agent of the Government. Not only is inflation the most vicious and uncontrolled method of hidden taxation, but it is the most inefficient, because it makes no provision whatever for inequities. Up to a certain point every family must spend about the same sum of money for the necessities of life. Beyond that point luxuries may enter into the picture. But, up to the point of luxury, each family, of necessity, must consume about so much bread and so much meat and so many vegetables and wear about so many clothes and burn about so much fuel to provide heat, and so on.

Obviously then, any taxation hidden in price must bear more heavily upon the poor consumer than upon the rich. Those who, by reason of a restricted purse, have to content themselves with hand-to-mouth buying pay a greater price than those who can buy in greater quantities. All sorts of inequities enter into this picture and it is for this reason that it is so essential to control inflation, or rather to prevent inflation as far as possible.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative J. WILLIAM DITTER, in a direct question to Mr. Leon Henderson during a session of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House asked Mr. Henderson point-blank whether or not there could be any such

thing as accurate price control without the control of all of the factors of cost. Mr. Henderson promptly answered that there could not. And yet, up to this hour, months and months afterward, the administration has evaded the issue of controlling all the costs of production, while, at the same time, trying to fix a good many prices.

One of the crying needs of the Nation at this time is a courageous attitude on the part of the administration to meet the growing inflation frankly and honestly in order to protect the low-income people of this Nation from this vicious form of hidden and indirect taxation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with what has been said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] concerning the automobile dealers' problem. This is serious, and Congress should do something at once to prevent these businesses from going to the wall.

It surely is not just to freeze a stock of cars, whether it be one or five hundred, without seeing to it that the dealer be protected financially from loss.

Certainly our United States can take better care of this as a whole, financially, rather than to make one group, already hard hit by necessary wartime regulations, go bankrupt.

Our Government should buy from every dealer every car frozen in stock. Our Government should allow the dealer sufficient overhead expense in connection with such transaction, that the dealer does not lose financially through such sale. I also strongly urge that any garage storing cars which can only be sold under certificates given out by rationing boards should be paid not only storage charges but also sufficient allowances to keep these new cars from deteriorating while in stock.

Congress must arrange as soon as possible some fair solution to this problem, as well as to the problems of the numerous small retail dealers in lines of business now clamped down upon because of war conditions, which certainly is no fault of theirs. We must all help to meet these problems and should not expect these men to perhaps lose their businesses of years' standing because of circumstances beyond their control.

Let us do something on this, Members of the House, before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert an article from the East Harlem News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert therein the result of Fortune management poll from Fortune Magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the House is in session on Thursday next I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes, following any other special orders that may have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot leave unchallenged the remarks that have been made here with regard to the activities of the War Production Board and especially the automotive branch with regard to the automobile dealers of this Nation.

There seems to be a continuous running barrage in and out of Congress charging inefficiency and dereliction of duty of Government officials. I believe that a certain amount of criticism is a healthy thing in a democratic form of government; however, when open blanket charges are made I do not believe it goes toward building unity that is so sadly needed in this Nation during these trying times. Charges of inefficiency should be specific, naming the individuals and setting forth the specific indictment of inefficiency of that individual, so that it can either be proven or disproved. This continuing indictment of inefficiency reflects upon the Government and only gives the enemies of our Nation an opportunity to carry on their underhanded attempt to break down the confidence of the people in our Government.

I believe that the officials of the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration are giving thorough and complete study to the whole problem that confronts the dealers and retailers of automobiles.

As we turn our memories back a year or so, we will find that this administration, realizing the grave responsibility that it was facing on the question of all-out production in the national defense of America, requested the great automotive industry to convert to the war program. The request so made was not complied with and a very concerted effort was carried on by the automotive industry to stop any curtailment in the production of automobiles. The result was that last year the automobile industry enjoyed the most profitable year in its history.

It was not until war stared us in the face that they realized the grave responsibility which was theirs and then followed out the request of the administration and converted their factories to war production. I want at this time to congratulate them on the fine cooperation they are now giving. I do not believe that there is any industry in the whole United States that is contributing more to our war program at the present time than the automotive industry. They certainly are going full production ahead in bombers, tanks, machine guns, and all

things that their plants can be retooled to in order to bring about 100 percent war production.

The shock that came necessarily so because of the delay in the automobile industry to realize their place in the war program was such that the automobile dealers, necessarily a part of this great program, were caught in the jam that followed. They had to sacrifice, and I understand very willingly, for the best interest of this Nation in the winning of the war. We fully realize that the dealers themselves cannot nor should not bear the full brunt of this burden. Therefore, the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board have been giving thorough study, as I said, to this grave problem.

There are two sections necessarily that must be considered, and they are: One, the handling of trucks; and, second, the handling of automobile passenger cars. I must at this time say that the Office of Price Administration has already proposed a dealers release plan to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is commonly known as the bail-out plan. I do not know the specific details of this plan, but I do know that the plan was proposed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation met or are meeting with the manufacturers in Detroit. The plan will permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to take the cars on hand that are held by the dealers at the original cost plus the financing and storage charges up to date and will allow the dealers to hold these cars under proper financing through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until they are called for under the rationing system and sold on the market.

So there is an effort on the part of the Government agencies charged with the handling of this part of the program. They cannot put into operation such a huge program overnight. It takes study and work, which necessarily takes time.

I have all the sympathy in the world for the dealers in the problem they are confronted with, but I also want it understood that our Government agencies and those charged with the duty of administering those agencies are doing their level best under the circumstances to relieve this very burdensome situation.

The plan, I understand, applies to both trucks and passenger cars. The reason that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials met with the manufacturers was to see that a proper agreement was made with the manufacturers, so that the cars and trucks would be delivered to the Government in good condition and that the manufacturers would guarantee such delivery through their dealers.

The Office of Price Administration set up their rationing program as of March 2 and a field inventory shows that there are on hand on the dealers' floors at the present time about 150,000 trucks, which will have to be parceled out over a period of 2 years. The first month's survey shows that under the present rationing plan there were about 8,000 units per month being moved and a study is being made to liberalize this rationing plan so as to increase the number of units to be

moved. In other words, that the whole program is to be speeded up.

They have not only worked on this problem as far as the retailers are concerned, but they have also set up another plan so as to give the dealers a certain means of revenue. That is, they have done everything in their power to see that cars and trucks are kept running and there has been a liberal flow of parts for repairs of automobiles and trucks now on the road. This has been a great help to the dealers. Of course, as time goes on, if there develops a shortage of parts, it will not be the fault of the War Production Board, but just one of those things that develops in wartime that cannot be helped, so that there might be a little difficulty in the repair work on cars and trucks in the future. However, every study possible is being given to the problem so as to give the dealers and garagemen the best that brains can produce. I do not believe there is any inefficiency that can be chargeable to these agencies and such charges should not be made loosely.

Let me say further that according to the latest official figures from the field that there has only been 40 percent of the quota of cars allotted for sale sold on the market since the rationing program has been put into effect. Therefore there is a study being made so that there will be a liberalizing of the present rationing plan that will help to move the present cars that are now being held by the dealers.

Another study that is being given by the Office of Price Administration is that they are attempting to buy up the junk cars for the reclaiming of the rubber that is on those junk cars and scrapping the metal to be used for scrap iron. This plan will be presented shortly to the Metals Reserve Corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

So necessarily in this conversion the automobile dealers throughout the United States have sacrificed but everything possible is being done to help them. It is only natural that when such a change in our usual business methods confronts us in the war program that we must meet it and meet it with sacrifice.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Michigan just made the statement that everything is being done which it is possible to do to aid these automobile retailers. Does the gentleman have in mind any specific thing that the Government is doing to aid these retail distributors at the present time?

Mr. HOOK. I understand that the War Production Board is doing everything it can by making a complete survey and giving all the assistance it can, as I just mentioned. I do not know of any other specific things, especially when this thing came as fast as it did, and in face of the fact they refused to meet the problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Who refused?

Mr. HOOK. The automobile manufacturers.

Mr. KEEFE. But we are dealing entirely with dealers.

Mr. HOOK. All right; the automobile dealer is only one step away from the manufacturer. When manufacturers cannot turn out any more cars, certainly dealers cannot sell cars; and if dealers cannot sell cars, then the dealers necessarily must meet the problem with the assistance of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen's time be extended 2 minutes so I may propound a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made reference to some remarks which I made earlier this afternoon dealing entirely with the problem of the local dealer who has on hand in his garage cars already manufactured which he cannot sell and dispose of. This is the complaint which has been made; and if the gentleman knows of anything that is being done by the Government to alleviate this situation I would like to have him tell the House, because I have not been told of it, and I do not know of any automobile dealer who knows of any such thing that is being done to help them.

Mr. HOOK. I understand—and I am willing to be corrected if I am wrong—that a financial set-up has been arrived at whereby each one of these dealers is being paid a certain sum for the storage of those cars, as I just mentioned. A schedule has been set up whereby certain classes of people are entitled to priorities on cars, physicians for example and those in key positions in the war program. The cars are to be rationed as they are needed.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman: Does he know of any activity of the Government through which these automobile dealers are being paid for the storage of these cars? If so, my dealers would like to know of it. I have never heard of any such thing.

Mr. HOOK. It is my understanding that there is, as I mentioned, although I may be wrong. I doubt that I am.

Mr. KEEFE. The suggestion was made at one time that some such thing as that be done, that the dealers be paid something for the storage and care of these cars; but nothing has been done, and nothing is being done today to alleviate the situation.

Mr. HOOK. There is at least an authorization that when the car is sold the dealer may charge the buyer with the storage and cost of financing, although I understand that this will be corrected by the plan of the Office of Price Administration and the R. F. C.

Mr. KEEFE. But the thing the gentleman seems to overlook is the fact that under the tire-rationing order and the limitations as to the character and type of people who can get certificates from the local rationing board—the opportunities to sell these cars in stock are so limited that the dealers will be eaten up with overhead and other expenses before they will ever be able to get rid of their stocks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. I do not know exactly what studies the War Production Board has actually made; all I know is what I am told, and that I must and intend to rely upon; but common sense, it seems to me, would indicate that when cars are not being manufactured as they were before the few cars available will be needed for specific purposes, and we cannot just dump those cars on the market with no replacement production coming out of the factories. What is going to happen then? They naturally must have a rationing system to conform with the plan they have developed.

Mr. KEEFE. No one will object to the gentleman's statement in that regard; that perhaps the rationing system may be all right; but the thing the gentleman wants to keep in mind is that we must not put the burden on these garage dealers to handle and store and service and finance these cars during the period of years this rationing program may be carried on. The Government ought to step in and take care of them.

Mr. HOOK. I agree with the gentleman; but the Government certainly must act at some place and formulate the best plan that can be devised under the circumstances. I do not think that the charge of inefficiency and dereliction of duty of the O. P. A. or the War Production Board or any of the officers or officials in charge is substantiated by the record. Time will prove that these men are fine, capable executives and administrators, doing, in my opinion, a fine job under very adverse conditions. Let us not be too critical at this time, but give credit where credit is due.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad this subject came up, because I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin is interested in the small dealer as well as I am, and I know, too, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is interested in the small dealer. I do not know whether either of those two gentlemen were present yesterday when I addressed the House for 8 minutes on the conditions that exist all over the country or not. In the first place there has been absolutely nothing done to help these dealers, although proposals have been made.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has the authority to lend certain money to these dealers, but that authority is not going to help these dealers, because in most cases the cars were purchased before this order went into effect. They were cars bought back in 1941, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cannot lend them money to carry on.

Yesterday I introduced a bill to help these dealers. You will find that the finance companies all over the country are now closing in on the small dealers, and they are going to take these cars away from them unless we do something immediately. As I stated, I introduced a bill yesterday authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend to these dealers as much money as is necessary, over any period of time necessary, to protect their entire equity, and when they have done that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will immediately become subrogated to the rights of these finance companies.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, nothing has been done, and if we wait and continue trying to get something done, it seems to me nothing will be done until these dealers are completely ruined. They are willing to sacrifice, they are not complaining about this freezing order at all, but many of them have not been able to sell one car since this order went into effect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the automobile dealers are not objecting to the sacrifices they have to make, but in many instances they have not been able to sell a single car because their sales are limited to certain classes of people.

May I say that in many instances these finance companies are demanding more in payment right now than these dealers are able to raise. They have not sold any cars and yet the dealers are told: "If you do not pay, we are going to come in and take your automobile." That situation exists due to the freezing order. They cannot sell, yet we have issued no order telling these finance companies that they cannot take the automobiles. The finance companies are going to profit. They are the war profiteers as a result of this order and it must be stopped.

I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. Hook and Mr. HOFFMAN] will get a copy of this bill and will assist in getting action in reference to this matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that I did hear the statement, and I heard his plea with reference to the bill which he has introduced. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HENDRICKS. But it is going to require immediate action and not a long time of hearings.

Mr. KEEFE. I tried to impress that on the House a moment ago. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], when I was speaking this afternoon, indicated that the Appropriations Committee has now appropriated for all departments of Gov-

ernment, the War, Army, and Navy, and has provided for all the items of procurement in the form of trucks, cars, and everything else that they can see a need for. If that is true, why does not the Army take all it needs off the hands of these dealers now and pay for them and if the Government's interest is protected, why not cut out this rationing business entirely?

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is because they have only been authorized but not directed to do so. We must direct them to do so. Something has got to be done about this situation or we are going to have a storm.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is only half-past 1; I know they are anxious to adjourn to go to the ball game.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am not going to the ball game. I have not the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mean the gentleman. Can the gentleman tell me how we, on the minority side, can help? The majority has control of this legislation and are not doing anything.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman can call the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and ask him to report this bill out so that we can get something done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I could do that, but that will not get your bill out.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It may if enough of you call.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You tell me how to help, and I will help.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is the only way; bring pressure on the committee, and ask them to do something, because it is necessary that something be done. I know that every Member of Congress is interested.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know they are. Two doors down from my home is located one of my bitterest local political opponents, and the last time I was home he had 11 new trucks that he cannot sell. He wants to get rid of them. He asked me how he could do it, but I do not know.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The Government can buy these cars outright, but it has not done that. We can pass a bill authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to let them have whatever money is necessary, over any period that is necessary, and subordinate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the rights of the finance companies who are going in now and taking these automobiles and making a profit because of the order issued by the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our farmers and co-ops want these trucks too, to haul milk and supplies to the creameries and mills. How can they get them?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I hope they can get them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, April 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, April 15, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April 17, 20, and 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1569. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Naselle River, Pacific County, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1570. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administration, covering the year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 699); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 494. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles O. Nevel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Joseph

Donatelli and Rose Donatelli; with amendment. (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4654. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie Lavoda Wiggins; with amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Alfred Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5013. A bill for the relief of James P. Crawford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5385. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Yates; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Lillian Woodward; with amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5680. A bill for the relief of James M. Hays; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6594. A bill for the relief of M. V. Forsythe; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6848. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6926. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 6927. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 6928. A bill to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6929. A bill to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6931. A bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6932. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to solidize itself with the policy of the President of the United States, the War Production Board, and labor organization, preferring the voluntary renunciation of labor of the right to strike and of the limitations of the working day; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enactment of House bill 6806; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2665. By Mr. FLIH: Petition of 34 residents of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 4000, a bill to take liquor out of Army and Navy camps as a patriotic measure to conserve the health, morale, and efficiency of our soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2666. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of J. O. Cameron and 66 other voters of Lawrence County, Pa., urging that Senate bill 860 be brought before the Congress and a favorable vote taken thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2667. Also, petition of 37 members of the West Sunbury United Presbyterian Church, Butler County, Pa., urging a ban on the sale of any intoxicating drink for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2668. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., 31 Boylston Street, Brookline, Mass., on freezing of cars; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2669. By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota: Resolution of the Aurora Lodge of the

A. F. and A. M. at Carrington, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2670. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Commercial National Bank of Greenville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference of meeting the national crisis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2671. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Smith-Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2672. Also, petition of a list of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, worship, honor, blessing, and power Thou art infinitely worthy to receive. We beseech Thee to mark for us the star on the horizon and let us hear the music on the troubled waters. Do Thou bless us with repose for meditation and reflection, compassing us with thoughts of seriousness, of responsibility, and inspiring us with a stimulus for righteousness, justice, and confidence. Cause us to use our power to bring the good things of life to those who are weak and impoverished and to give them the chartered rights to peace, happiness, and self-realization.

Remind us, our Father, in the midst of ill tidings, of Thy eternal calm and that Thou art a tower of defense to those who call Thee Lord and Master. Prepare our hands anew for heavy tasks, for willing sacrifice, and for the duties demanded by each day. In the hours of peril be Thou with our country's defenders in the far-away places of this torn earth; keep them strong and hopeful while our souls speak by our prayers and by our unwavering devotion. Blessed Lord, save us all from that hate which engenders blindness and at the last causes spiritual death. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this bill have in it the pay raise for the men in the service?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it does not.